

1 AMY W. SCHULMAN  
2 DLA PIPER LLP  
3 1251 Avenue of the Americas  
4 New York, NY 10020  
5 Telephone: (212) 335-4500  
6 Facsimile: (212) 335-4501  
7 amy.schulman@dlapiper.com

5 STUART M. GORDON (SBN: 037477)  
6 GORDON & REES LLP  
7 Embarcadero Center West  
8 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
Facsimile: (415) 986-8054  
sgordon@gordonrees.com

10 MICHAEL C. ZELLERS (SBN: 146904)  
11 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP  
12 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
13 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
14 Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
15 Facsimile: (213) 430-3409  
16 [michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com](mailto:michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com)

14 Attorneys for Defendants  
PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION, AND  
G.D. SEARLE LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 IN RE CELEBREX AND BEXTRA ) MDL Docket No. 1699  
20 MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND )  
21 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION ) CASE NO. 3:08-cv-0794-CRB  
22 *This document relates to* )  
23 BRIAN SCOGIN, ) PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA  
24 ) CORPORATION, AND G.D.  
25 Plaintiff, ) SEARLE, LLC'S ANSWER TO  
26 ) COMPLAINT  
27 vs. ) JURY DEMAND ENDORSED  
28 PFIZER, INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION, ) HEREIN  
29 and G.D. SEARLE, LLC, )  
30 Defendants. )

NOW COME Defendants Pfizer Inc. (improperly captioned in Plaintiff's Complaint as "Pfizer, Inc.") ("Pfizer"), Pharmacia Corporation ("Pharmacia"), and G.D. Searle LLC (improperly captioned in Plaintiff's Complaint as "G.D. Searle, LLC") ("Searle") (collectively "Defendants"), and file this Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint ("Complaint"), and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

L.

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

8 The Complaint does not state in sufficient detail when Plaintiff was prescribed or used  
9 Bextra® (valdecoxib) (“Bextra®”). Accordingly, this Answer can only be drafted generally.  
10 Defendants may seek leave to amend this Answer when discovery reveals the specific time  
11 periods in which Plaintiff was prescribed and used Bextra®.

II.

## ANSWER

## **Response to Allegations Regarding Parties**

15 1. Defendants admit that Plaintiff brought this civil action seeking monetary damages, but  
16 deny that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief or damages. Defendants admit that, during certain  
17 periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States  
18 to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
19 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of  
20 time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed,  
21 co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare  
22 providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the  
23 FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
25 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
27 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
28 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

1 2. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
2 truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff's age and citizenship, and, therefore, deny the same.  
3 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 3. Defendants admit that Pfizer is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
5 business in New York. Defendants admit that Pharmacia acquired Searle in 2000 and that, as  
6 the result of a merger in April 2003, Searle and Pharmacia became subsidiaries of Pfizer.  
7 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer marketed and co-promoted  
8 Bextra® in the United States, including the States of California and Arkansas, to be prescribed  
9 by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their  
10 approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in  
11 interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form  
12 a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the  
13 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 4. Defendants admit that Searle is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal  
15 place of business in Illinois. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra®  
16 was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted  
17 and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
18 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
19 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 5. Defendants admit that Pharmacia is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of  
21 business in New Jersey. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pharmacia  
22 marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States, including the States of California and  
23 Arkansas, to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe  
24 drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Plaintiff's  
25 allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are  
26 without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and,  
27 therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this Paragraph of the  
28 Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

## **Response to Allegations Regarding Jurisdiction and Venue**

6. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the amount in controversy, and, therefore, deny that the same. However, Defendants admit that Plaintiff claims that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

7. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiff's citizenship, and, therefore, deny the same. However, Defendants admit that Plaintiff claims that the parties are diverse. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the judicial district in which the asserted claims allegedly arose, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny committing a tort in the States of California and Arkansas, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States, including the States of California and Arkansas, to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®. Defendants admit that they do business in the State of Texas. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

## **Response to Allegations Regarding Interdistrict Assignment**

10. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants admit that this case should be transferred to In re: Bextra and Celebrex Marketing, Sales Prac. and Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL-1699, assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on September 6, 2005.

## **Response to Factual Allegations**

11. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff's citizenship, medical condition, and whether Plaintiff used Bextra®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

13. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14. Defendants admit that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial change from the time of sale. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to

1 form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and,  
2 therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations this paragraph of the  
3 Complaint.

4 15. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
6 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
7 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
8 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
9 the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
10 Defendants deny remaining the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 15 of the Complaint,  
12 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
13 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 16. Defendants admit that Bextra® is in a class of drugs that is, at times, referred to as non-  
15 steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (“NSAIDS”). Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe  
16 and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information.  
17 Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its  
18 FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
19 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
20 paragraph of the Complaint.

21 17. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants  
22 and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
23 Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this  
24 paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to  
25 form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

26 18. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants  
27 and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
28 Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to  
2 form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

3 19. Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the  
4 Complaint. Defendants lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth  
5 of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

6 20. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are  
7 vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to  
8 the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful  
9 conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 21. Plaintiff does not allege having used Celebrex® in this Complaint. Nevertheless,  
11 Defendants admit that Celebrex® was launched in the United States in February 1999.  
12 Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
13 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time,  
14 Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be  
15 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
16 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time,  
17 Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-  
18 promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare  
19 providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the  
20 FDA. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx® are not  
21 directed toward Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is  
22 deemed required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the  
23 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx®. Defendants  
24 therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such  
25 allegations and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
26 paragraph of the Complaint.

27 22. Defendants admit that the New Drug Application for Bextra® was filed with the FDA  
28 on January 15, 2001. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 FDA, that Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis  
2 and adult rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea.  
3 Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and  
4 ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
5 such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
6 this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 23. Defendants admit that Bextra® was approved by the FDA on November 16, 2001.  
8 Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is  
9 indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid  
10 arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining  
11 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 24. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
13 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
14 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny  
15 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 25. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
17 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
18 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
19 that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved  
20 prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are  
21 adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was  
22 adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the  
23 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 26. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
26 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
27 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
28 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law  
2 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit  
3 that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which  
4 developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be  
5 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance  
6 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding  
7 "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or  
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same.  
9 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
10 the Complaint.

11 27. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
12 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
13 denied. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
15 this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 28. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants  
17 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
18 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
19 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
20 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 29. Defendants admit that the New Drug Application for Bextra® was filed with the FDA  
22 on January 15, 2001. Defendants admit that Bextra® was approved by the FDA, on November  
23 16, 2001. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and the remaining allegations in this  
24 paragraph of the Complaint.

25 30. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
27 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
28 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 31. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
3 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the allegations in this  
4 paragraph of the Complaint.

5 32. Defendants state that the referenced FDA Talk Paper for Bextra® speaks for itself and  
6 respectfully refer the Court to the Talk Paper for its actual language and text. Any attempt to  
7 characterize the Talk Paper is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
8 paragraph of the Complaint.

9 33. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
10 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
11 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 34. Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations concerning the “post-drug  
13 approval meta-analysis study” in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants are without  
14 sufficient information to confirm or deny such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.  
15 Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to  
16 the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is denied.  
17 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 35. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants  
19 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
20 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
21 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
22 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 36. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and  
25 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 37. Defendants state that the referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself  
27 and respectfully refer the Court to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language  
28 and text. Any attempt to characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 38. Defendants state that the referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself  
3 and respectfully refer the Court to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language  
4 and text. Any attempt to characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied.  
5 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 39. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
7 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
8 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 40. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
10 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
11 this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 41. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
13 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
14 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 42. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
16 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
17 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 43. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
19 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
20 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 44. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
22 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the allegations in this  
23 paragraph of the Complaint.

24 45. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
25 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
26 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
27 paragraph of the Complaint.

28 46. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 and, therefore, no response is necessary. Should a response be deemed necessary, Defendants  
2 state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for  
3 its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny  
4 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 47. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
6 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
7 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
8 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
9 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 48. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
11 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
12 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
13 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
14 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
15 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 49. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
17 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
18 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
19 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
20 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
21 the Complaint.

22 50. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
23 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
24 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
25 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
26 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
27 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
28 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
2 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
3 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
4 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants are without knowledge or information  
5 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used  
6 Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
7 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 51. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx® are not directed  
9 toward Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed  
10 required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in  
11 this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx®. Defendants therefore lack sufficient  
12 information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore,  
13 deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in  
14 this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 52. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
16 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
17 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 53. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
20 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
21 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
22 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
23 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
24 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
25 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
26 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
27 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
28 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
2 paragraph of the Complaint.

3 54. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
4 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
5 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
6 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
7 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is unreasonably dangerous, and  
8 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 55. Defendants admit that the FDA Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and  
10 Communications (“DDMAC”) sent a letter to Pfizer dated January 10, 2005. Defendants state  
11 that the referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its  
12 actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants admit  
13 that the DDMAC sent a letter to Searle dated October 6, 1999. Defendants state that the  
14 referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its actual  
15 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants state that the  
16 transcripts of the FDA Arthritis Drugs Advisory Committee hearings speak for themselves and  
17 respectfully refer the Court to the transcripts for their actual language and text. Any attempt to  
18 characterize the transcripts is denied. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for  
19 itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt  
20 to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
21 paragraph of the Complaint.

22 56. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra®  
23 is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
24 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
25 that the referenced press release speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the press  
26 release for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the press release is denied.  
27 Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to  
28 the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
2 the Complaint.

3 57. Defendants state that the referenced press release speaks for itself and respectfully refer  
4 the Court to the press release for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the  
5 press release is denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining  
6 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 58. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
8 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
9 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
10 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
11 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
12 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
13 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
14 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
15 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
16 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
17 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert  
18 approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms  
19 of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary  
20 dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 59. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
22 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
23 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
24 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
25 Defendants state that Plaintiff's allegations regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and  
26 ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of  
27 such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
28 that Bextra® is defective, and deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 60. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
2 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
3 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
4 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
5 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
6 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
7 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
8 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
9 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
10 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
11 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
12 paragraph of the Complaint.

13 61. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
15 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
16 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
17 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 62. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23 the Complaint.

24 63. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
26 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
27 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
28 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 the Complaint.

2 64. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 65. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
4 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
5 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
6 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
7 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
8 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
9 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
10 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
11 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
12 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
13 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
14 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 66. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
16 truth of the allegations regarding and whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the  
17 same. Defendants state that the referenced press releases speak for themselves and respectfully  
18 refer the Court to the press releases for their actual language and text. Any attempt to  
19 characterize the press releases is denied. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
20 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
21 state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-  
22 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with  
23 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
24 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 67. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
26 truth of the allegations regarding and whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the  
27 same. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
2 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
3 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
4 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 68. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
6 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
7 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
8 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
9 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
10 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 69. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
12 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
13 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
14 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
15 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
16 the Complaint.

17 70. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 71. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
20 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
21 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
22 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
23 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-  
24 promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law  
25 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit  
26 that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which  
27 developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be  
28 prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
2 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 72. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
4 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
5 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
6 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
7 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
8 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
9 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
10 paragraph of the Complaint.

11 **Response to First Cause of Action: Negligence**

12 73. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
13 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

14 74. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
15 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
16 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
17 duties. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described  
18 in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported  
19 with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and  
20 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants  
21 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 75. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
23 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
24 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
25 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in  
27 this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 76. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants  
2 admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such duties.  
3 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
4 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
5 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
6 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
7 any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint,  
8 including all subparts.

9 77. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
10 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
11 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
12 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
13 Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of  
14 the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
15 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
16 the Complaint.

17 78. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
19 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
20 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
21 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
22 the Complaint.

23 79. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
24 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
25 that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
26 paragraph of the Complaint.

27 80. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
 2 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
 3 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
 4 the Complaint.

5 81. The allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx® are not directed  
 6 toward Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed  
 7 required, Defendants state that Plaintiff fails to provide the proper context for the allegations in  
 8 this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx®. Defendants therefore lack sufficient  
 9 information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore,  
 10 deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in  
 11 this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 82. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the  
 13 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is  
 14 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
 15 paragraph of the Complaint.

16 83. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 17 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 84. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
 19 damage and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 84 of the Complaint,  
 21 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
 22 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 **Response to Second Cause of Action: Strict Liability**

24 85. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
 25 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

26 86. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
 27 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
 28 Defendants admit that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial change in

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

1 the condition from the time of sale. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective  
2 when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that  
3 the potential effects of Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved  
4 prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable  
5 standards of care and law. Defendants deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably  
6 dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all  
7 subparts.

87. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
9 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
10 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
11 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
12 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

88. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
13 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
14 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
15 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
16 Defendants deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining  
17 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

89. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
19 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
20 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
21 Defendants deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining  
22 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

90. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
23 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants  
24 are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
25 allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-  
2 approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra® were  
3 and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all  
4 times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny that  
5 Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
6 paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

7 91. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
8 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
9 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
10 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
11 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
12 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
13 that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
14 paragraph of the Complaint.

15 92. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
16 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
17 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
18 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
19 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
20 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
21 that Bextra® is defective and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 93. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
23 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
24 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 94. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
27 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
28 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, deny that Bextra®  
2 caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the  
3 Complaint.

4 95. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
6 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
7 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
8 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective, and deny the remaining  
9 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 96. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
11 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
12 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
13 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
14 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
15 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
16 that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Bextra®  
17 in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to  
18 prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during  
19 certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed,  
20 tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by  
21 healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their  
22 approval by the FDA. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective,  
23 deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
24 paragraph of the Complaint.

25 97. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
27 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
28 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 98. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
3 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
4 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
5 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
6 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
7 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
8 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
9 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 99. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
11 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
12 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
13 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
14 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
15 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
16 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17 100. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and  
19 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 101. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
21 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
22 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
23 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
24 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
25 the Complaint.

26 102. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
27 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
28 that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 paragraph of the Complaint.

2 103. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
3 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 104. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
5 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 104 of the Complaint, Defendants  
7 deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the  
8 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 **Response to Third Cause of Action: Breach of Express Warranty**

10 105. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
11 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

12 106. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
13 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
14 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
15 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
16 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
17 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
18 that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®. Defendants  
19 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 107. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
21 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.

22 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
23 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
24 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
25 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit  
26 that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Bextra®. Defendants  
27 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

28 108. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 109. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
2 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
3 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
4 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
5 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
6 Bextra®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 110. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
9 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
11 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
12 Bextra®. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
13 the Complaint.

14 111. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
15 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
16 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
17 Bextra®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 112. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23 the Complaint.

24 113. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
26 that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
27 paragraph of the Complaint.

28 114. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or

1 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 115. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
3 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 115 of the Complaint, Defendants  
5 deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the  
6 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 **Response to Fourth Cause of Action: Breach of Implied Warranty**

8 116. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
9 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10 117. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
11 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
12 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
13 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
14 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
15 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
16 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
17 paragraph of the Complaint.

18 118. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding  
19 Bextra®. Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that  
20 Bextra® is indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult  
21 rheumatoid arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants state  
22 that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved  
23 prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the  
24 Complaint.

25 119. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
26 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
27 Defendants admit, as indicated in the package insert approved by the FDA, that Bextra® is  
28 indicated for use in the relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis and adult rheumatoid

1       arthritis, as well as for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea. Defendants deny the remaining  
2       allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3       120. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
4       truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
5       Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
6       FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
7       paragraph of the Complaint.

8       121. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
9       truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
10      Defendants state that Bextra® was expected to reach consumers without substantial change in  
11      the condition from the time of sale. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
12      paragraph of the Complaint.

13      122. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
14      truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
15      Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
16      FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the  
17      remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18      123. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19      with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20      Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21      which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22      Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23      the Complaint.

24      124. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25      with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
26      that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
27      paragraph of the Complaint.

28      125. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 126. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
3 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 126 of the Complaint, Defendants  
5 deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the  
6 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 **Response to Fifth Cause of Action: Fraudulent Misrepresentation & Concealment**

8 127. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
9 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10 128. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to  
11 which no response is deemed required. To the extent a response is deemed required,  
12 Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such  
13 duties. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
15 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
17 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 129. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
20 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23 the Complaint, including all subparts.

24 130. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
26 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
27 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
28 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 the Complaint.

2 131. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
3 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
4 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
5 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
6 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® is defective or unreasonably  
7 dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 132. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
9 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
10 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
11 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
12 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
13 the Complaint.

14 133. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this  
15 paragraph of the Complaint.

16 134. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
17 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
18 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
19 the Complaint.

20 135. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
21 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
22 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
23 the Complaint.

24 136. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
25 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
26 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
27 the Complaint.

28 137. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this

1 paragraph of the Complaint.

2 138. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
3 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
4 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
5 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Bextra®  
6 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at  
7 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny  
8 any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 139. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
10 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of  
11 Bextra® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,  
12 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.  
13 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of  
14 the Complaint.

15 140. Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance  
16 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny  
17 that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this  
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 141. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
20 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 142. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or  
22 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 142 of the Complaint, Defendants  
24 deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage, and deny the  
25 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 **Response to Sixth Cause of Action: Unjust Enrichment**

27 143. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiff's  
28 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 144. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed  
2 and co-promoted Bextra® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are  
3 by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants  
4 admit that, during certain periods of time, Bextra® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,  
5 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Bextra® in the United States to  
6 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in  
7 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
8 paragraph of the Complaint.

9 145. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
10 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
11 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 146. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
13 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
14 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 147. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
16 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
17 Defendants state that Bextra® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its  
18 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this  
19 paragraph of the Complaint.

20 148. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the  
21 truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiff used Bextra® and, therefore, deny the same.  
22 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

23 Answering the unnumbered paragraph following Paragraph 148 of the Complaint,  
24 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,  
25 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 **Response to Prayer for Relief**

27 Answering the unnumbered paragraph of the Complaint headed "Prayer for Relief,"  
28 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Bextra® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,

and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

III.

## **GENERAL DENIAL**

Defendants deny all allegations and/or legal conclusions set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint that have not been previously admitted, denied, or explained.

IV.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Defendants reserve the right to rely upon any of the following or additional defenses to claims asserted by Plaintiff to the extent that such defenses are supported by information developed through discovery or evidence at trial. Defendants affirmatively show that:

## **First Defense**

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

## **Second Defense**

2. Bextra® is a prescription medical product. The federal government has preempted the field of law applicable to the labeling and warning of prescription medical products. Defendants' labeling and warning of Bextra® was at all times in compliance with applicable federal law. Plaintiff's causes of action against Defendants, therefore, fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; such claims, if allowed, would conflict with applicable federal law and violate the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.

## **Third Defense**

3. At all relevant times, Defendants provided proper warnings, information and instructions for the drug in accordance with generally recognized and prevailing standards in existence at the time.

## **Fourth Defense**

4. At all relevant times, Defendants' warnings and instructions with respect to the use of Bextra® conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of knowledge at the time the drug was manufactured, marketed and distributed.

**Fifth Defense**

5. Plaintiff's action is time-barred as it is filed outside of the time permitted by the  
3 applicable Statute of Limitations, and same is pled in full bar of any liability as to Defendants.

**Sixth Defense**

6. Plaintiff's action is barred by the statute of repose.

**Seventh Defense**

7. Plaintiff's claims against Defendants are barred to the extent Plaintiff was contributorily  
8 negligent, actively negligent or otherwise failed to mitigate their damages, and any recovery by  
9 Plaintiff should be diminished accordingly.

**Eighth Defense**

8. The proximate cause of the loss complained of by Plaintiff is not due to any acts or  
12 omissions on the part of Defendants. Rather, said loss is due to the acts or omissions on the  
13 part of third parties unrelated to Defendants and for whose acts or omissions Defendants are not  
14 liable in any way.

**Ninth Defense**

9. The acts and/or omissions of unrelated third parties as alleged constituted independent,  
17 intervening causes for which Defendants cannot be liable.

**Tenth Defense**

10. Any injuries or expenses incurred by Plaintiff were not caused by Bextra®, but were  
20 proximately caused, in whole or in part, by an idiosyncratic reaction, operation of nature, or act  
21 of God.

**Eleventh Defense**

11. Defendants affirmatively deny that they violated any duty owed to Plaintiff.

**Twelfth Defense**

12. A manufacturer has no duty to warn patients or the general public of any risk,  
26 contraindication, or adverse effect associated with the use of a prescription medical product.  
27 Rather, the law requires that all such warnings and appropriate information be given to the  
28 prescribing physician and the medical profession, which act as a "learned intermediary" in

1 determining the use of the product. Bextra® is a prescription medical product, available only  
2 on the order of a licensed physician. Bextra® provided an adequate warning to Plaintiff's  
3 treating and prescribing physicians.

4 **Thirteenth Defense**

5 13. The product at issue was not in a defective condition or unreasonably dangerous at the  
6 time it left the control of the manufacturer or seller.

7 **Fourteenth Defense**

8 14. Bextra® was at all times material to the Complaint reasonably safe and reasonably fit  
9 for its intended use and the warnings and instructions accompanying Bextra® at the time of the  
10 occurrence of the injuries alleged by Plaintiff were legally adequate for its approved usages.

11 **Fifteenth Defense**

12 15. Plaintiff's causes of action are barred in whole or in part by the lack of a defect as the  
13 Bextra® allegedly ingested by Plaintiff was prepared in accordance with the applicable  
14 standard of care.

15 **Sixteenth Defense**

16 16. Plaintiff's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of misuse or abnormal use of  
17 the product Bextra® after the product left the control of Defendants and any liability of  
18 Defendants is therefore barred.

19 **Seventeenth Defense**

20 17. Plaintiff's alleged damages were not caused by any failure to warn on the part of  
21 Defendants.

22 **Eighteenth Defense**

23 18. Plaintiff's alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of preexisting or subsequent  
24 conditions unrelated to Bextra®.

25 **Nineteenth Defense**

26 19. Plaintiff knew or should have known of any risk associated with Bextra®; therefore, the  
27 doctrine of assumption of the risk bars or diminishes any recovery.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

## Twentieth Defense

20. Plaintiff is barred from recovering against Defendants because Plaintiff's claims are preempted in accordance with the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution and by the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, 21 U.S.C. § 301 et. seq.

## Twenty-first Defense

21. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part under the applicable state law because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue was subject to and received pre-market approval by the Food and Drug Administration under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

## Twenty-second Defense

22. The manufacture, distribution and sale of the pharmaceutical product referred to in Plaintiff's Complaint was at all times in compliance with all federal regulations and statutes, and Plaintiff's causes of action are preempted.

### **Twenty-third Defense**

23. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part by the deference given to the primary jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration over the subject pharmaceutical product at issue under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

## Twenty-fourth Defense

24. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because there is no private right of action concerning matters regulated by the Food and Drug Administration under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

## **Twenty-fifth Defense**

25. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendants provided adequate "direction or warnings" as to the use of the subject pharmaceutical product within the meaning of Comment j to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

## Twenty-sixth Defense

26. Plaintiff's claims are barred or limited to a product liability failure to warn claim because Bextra® is a prescription pharmaceutical drug and falls within the ambit of Restatement (Second) of Torts § 402A, Comment k.

## **Twenty-seventh Defense**

27. Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue "provides net benefits for a class of patients" within the meaning of Comment f to § 6 of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

## Twenty-eighth Defense

28. Plaintiff's claims are barred under § 4, et seq., of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

## **Twenty-ninth Defense**

29. To the extent that Plaintiff is seeking punitive damages, Plaintiff has failed to plead facts sufficient under the law to justify an award of punitive damages.

## **Thirtieth Defense**

30. Defendants affirmatively aver that the imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate Defendants' rights to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Constitutions of the States of California and Arkansas, and would additionally violate Defendants' rights to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

## Thirty-first Defense

31. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

## **Thirty-second Defense**

32. The imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

### Thirty-third Defense

33. Plaintiff's punitive damage claims are preempted by federal law.

## Thirty-fourth Defense

34. In the event that reliance was placed upon Defendants' nonconformance to an express representation, this action is barred as there was no reliance upon representations, if any, of Defendants.

**Thirty-fifth Defense**

35. Plaintiff failed to provide Defendants with timely notice of any alleged nonconformance to any express representation.

**Thirty-sixth Defense**

36. To the extent that Plaintiff's claims are based on a theory providing for liability without proof of causation, the claims violate Defendants' rights under the United States Constitution.

**Thirty-seventh Defense**

37. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the advertisements, if any, and labeling with respect to the subject pharmaceutical products were not false or misleading and, therefore, constitute protected commercial speech under the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution.

**Thirty-eighth Defense**

38. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks punitive damages for the conduct which allegedly caused injuries asserted in the Complaint, punitive damages are barred or reduced by applicable law or statute or, in the alternative, are unconstitutional insofar as they violate the due process protections afforded by the United States Constitution, the excessive fines clause of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, and the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution, and applicable provisions of the Constitutions of the States of California and Arkansas. Any law, statute, or other authority purporting to permit the recovery of punitive damages in this case is unconstitutional, facially and as applied, to the extent that, without limitation, it: (1) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to guide and restrain the jury's discretion in determining whether to award punitive damages and/or the amount, if any; (2) is void for vagueness in that it failed to provide adequate advance notice as to what conduct will result in punitive damages; (3) permits recovery of punitive damages based on out-of-state conduct, conduct that complied with applicable law, or conduct that was not directed, or did not proximately cause harm, to Plaintiff; (4) permits recovery of punitive damages in an amount that is not both reasonable and proportionate to the amount of harm, if any, to Plaintiff and to the amount of compensatory

1 damages, if any; (5) permits jury consideration of net worth or other financial information  
 2 relating to Defendants; (6) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to be applied by the trial  
 3 court in post-verdict review of any punitive damages awards; (7) lacks constitutionally  
 4 sufficient standards for appellate review of punitive damages awards; and (8) otherwise fails to  
 5 satisfy Supreme Court precedent, including, without limitation, *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v.*  
 6 *Haslip*, 499 U.S. 1 (1991), *TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 443  
 7 (1993); *BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore*, 519 U.S. 559 (1996); and *State Farm Mut. Auto*  
 8 *Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 538 U.S. 408 (2003).

9 **Thirty-ninth Defense**

10 39. The methods, standards, and techniques utilized with respect to the manufacture, design,  
 11 and marketing of Bextra®, if any, used in this case, included adequate warnings and  
 12 instructions with respect to the product's use in the package insert and other literature, and  
 13 conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of the  
 14 knowledge at the time the product was marketed.

15 **Fortieth Defense**

16 40. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because Bextra® was designed, tested,  
 17 manufactured and labeled in accordance with the state-of-the-art industry standards existing at  
 18 the time of the sale.

19 **Forty-first Defense**

20 41. If Plaintiff sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and  
 21 belief, such injuries and losses were caused by the actions of persons not having real or  
 22 apparent authority to take said actions on behalf of Defendants and over whom Defendants had  
 23 no control and for whom Defendants may not be held accountable.

24 **Forty-second Defense**

25 42. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra®  
 26 was not unreasonably dangerous or defective, was suitable for the purpose for which it was  
 27 intended, and was distributed with adequate and sufficient warnings.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

## **Forty-third Defense**

43. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, and/or estoppel.

## **Forty-fourth Defense**

44. Plaintiff's claims are barred because Plaintiff's injuries, if any, were the result of the pre-existing and/or unrelated medical, genetic and/or environmental conditions, diseases or illnesses, subsequent medical conditions or natural courses of conditions of Plaintiff, and were independent of or far removed from Defendants' conduct.

## Forty-fifth Defense

45. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra® did not proximately cause injuries or damages to Plaintiff.

## **Forty-sixth Defense**

46. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Plaintiff did not incur any ascertainable loss as a result of Defendants' conduct.

## **Forty-seventh Defense**

47. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because the manufacturing, labeling, packaging, and any advertising of the product complied with the applicable codes, standards and regulations established, adopted, promulgated or approved by any applicable regulatory body, including but not limited to the United States, any state, and any agency thereof.

## Forty-eighth Defense

48. The claims must be dismissed because Plaintiff would have taken Bextra® even if the product labeling contained the information that Plaintiff contends should have been provided.

## Forty-ninth Defense

49. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because the utility of Bextra® outweighed its risks.

## **Fiftieth Defense**

50. Plaintiff's damages, if any, are barred or limited by the payments received from

1 collateral sources.

2 **Fifty-first Defense**

3 51. Defendants' liability, if any, can only be determined after the percentages of  
4 responsibility of all persons who caused or contributed toward Plaintiff's alleged damages, if  
5 any, are determined. Defendants seek an adjudication of the percentage of fault of the  
6 claimants and each and every other person whose fault could have contributed to the alleged  
7 injuries and damages, if any, of Plaintiff.

8 **Fifty-second Defense**

9 52. Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of abstention in that the  
10 common law gives deference to discretionary actions by the United States Food and Drug  
11 Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

12 **Fifty-third Defense**

13 53. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Bextra® is  
14 comprehensively regulated by the FDA pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act  
15 ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. §§ 301 *et seq.*, and regulations promulgated there under, and Plaintiff's  
16 claims conflict with the FDCA, with the regulations promulgated by FDA to implement the  
17 FDCA, with the purposes and objectives of the FDCA and FDA's implementing regulations,  
18 and with the specific determinations by FDA specifying the language that should be used in the  
19 labeling accompanying Bextra®. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claims are preempted by the  
20 Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, Article VI, clause 2, and the laws of the  
21 United States.

22 **Fifty-fourth Defense**

23 54. Plaintiff's misrepresentation allegations are not stated with the degree of particularity  
24 required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) and should be dismissed.

25 **Fifty-fifth Defense**

26 55. Defendants state on information and belief that the Complaint and each purported cause  
27 of action contained therein is barred by the statutes of limitations contained in California Code  
28 of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1 and 338 and former § 340(3), and such other statutes of limitation

1 as may apply.

2 **Fifty-sixth Defense**

3 56. Defendants state on information and belief that any injuries, losses, or damages suffered  
 4 by Plaintiff were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence or other actionable  
 5 conduct of persons or entities other than Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiff's recovery against  
 6 Defendants, if any, should be reduced pursuant to California Civil Code § 1431.2.

7 **Fifty-seventh Defense**

8 57. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of  
 9 Defendants, no act or omission was oppressive, fraudulent, or malicious under California Civil  
 10 Code § 3294, and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred. Any claim for punitive  
 11 damages is also barred under California Civil Code § 3294(b).

12 **Fifty-eighth Defense**

13 58. Plaintiff's fraud based claims, if any, are not stated with particularity as required by  
 14 Rule 9 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or Rule 9 of the Arkansas Rules of Civil  
 15 Procedure.

16 **Fifty-ninth Defense**

17 59. Plaintiff's damages, if any, must be reduced by the percentage of fault attributable to  
 18 Plaintiff and to nonparties as provided by Ark. Code Ann. § 16-55-202.

19 **Sixtieth Defense**

20 60. Plaintiff's claims are barred and/or limited by the provisions of the Arkansas Products  
 21 Liability Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 16-116-101, et seq.

22 **Sixty-first Defense**

23 61. Plaintiff's claims for punitive damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the Arkansas  
 24 Civil Justice Reform Act of 2003, Ark. Code Ann. § 16-55-201, et seq.

25 **Sixty-second Defense**

26 62. If Plaintiff sustained any injuries or incurred any losses or damages as alleged in the  
 27 Complaint, the same were caused by the negligence or fault of the Plaintiff and Plaintiff's  
 28 damages, if any, are barred or reduced by the doctrines of comparative fault and contributory

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
 275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
 San Francisco, CA 94111

1 negligence, and by the failure to mitigate damages.

2 **Sixty-third Defense**

3 63. If Plaintiff sustained any injuries or incurred any losses or damages as alleged in the  
4 Complaint, the same were caused by the unforeseeable alteration, change, improper handling,  
5 abnormal use, or other unforeseeable misuse of Bextra® by persons other than Defendants or  
6 persons acting on Defendants' behalf after the product left the control of Defendants.

7 **Sixty-fourth Defense**

8 64. Any claims for breach of warranty are barred for lack of reasonable reliance, lack of  
9 timely notice, lack of privity, and because the alleged warranties were excluded and/or  
10 disclaimed.

11 **Sixty-fifth Defense**

12 65. Defendants reserve the right to supplement their assertion of defenses as they continue  
13 with their factual investigation of Plaintiff's claims.

14 V.

15 **PRAYER**

16 WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

17 1. That Plaintiff take nothing from Defendants by reason of the Complaint;  
18 2. That the Complaint be dismissed;  
19 3. That Defendants be awarded their costs for this lawsuit;  
20 4. That the trier of fact determine what percentage of the combined fault or other liability  
21 of all persons whose fault or other liability proximately caused Plaintiff's alleged  
22 injuries, losses or damages is attributable to each person;  
23 5. That any judgment for damages against Defendants in favor of Plaintiff be no greater  
24 than an amount which equals their proportionate share, if any, of the total fault or other  
25 liability which proximately caused Plaintiff's injuries and damages; and  
26 6. That Defendants have such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 March 26, 2008

GORDON & REES LLP

2

3 By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/

4

5 Stuart M. Gordon  
6 sgordon@gordonrees.com  
7 Embarcadero Center West  
8 275 Battery Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
10 Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
11 Fax: (415) 986-8054

12 March 26, 2008

13 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

14

15 By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/

16

17 Michael C. Zellers  
18 michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com  
19 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
20 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
21 Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
22 Fax: (213) 430-3409

23

24 Attorneys for Defendants  
25 PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA  
26 CORPORATION, AND G.D. SEARLE  
27 LLC

28

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 **JURY DEMAND**

2 Defendants Pfizer Inc., Pharmacia Corporation, and G.D. Searle LLC, hereby demand a  
3 trial by jury of all the facts and issues in this case pursuant to 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
4 Procedure.

5 March 26, 2008

GORDON & REES LLP

6

7 By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Stuart M. Gordon  
sgordon@gordonrees.com  
Embarcadero Center West  
275 Battery Street, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 986-5900  
Fax: (415) 986-8054

March 26, 2008

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Michael C. Zellers  
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com  
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223  
Telephone: (213) 430-3400  
Fax: (213) 430-3409

Attorneys for Defendants  
PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA  
CORPORATION, AND G.D. SEARLE  
LLC

Gordon & Rees, LLP  
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111